



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,984	09/30/2003	Andrew R. Ferlitsch	10237.32	7696
65400	7590	02/18/2009	EXAMINER	
KIRTON & MCCONKIE			HUNTSINGER, PETER K	
1800 EAGLE GATE TOWER / 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE				
P.O. BOX 45120			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84145-0120			2625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/18/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/676,984	FERLITSCH, ANDREW R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Peter K. Huntsinger	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/3/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues on pages 11-13 of the response in essence that:

One of ordinary skill in the art would not find it obvious to utilize a file bundle requiring multiple applications to open the sub-files of the Sinofsky '178 file bundle.

- a. Sinofsky '178 is relied upon to teach a single file document containing separate sub-images (col. 3, lines 6-19, compound document that contains sub-files). At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate multiple files into one comprehensive file. The motivation for doing so would have been to maintain the integrity of the comprehensive file (col. 2, lines 16-25).

The applicant argues on page 13 of the response in essence that:

Warmus '149 and Sinofsky '178 do not disclose a rendering device that renders a single file having sub-images that are rendered as parts of pages of the file.

- b. Warmus '149 discloses a rendering device that renders a single file having images that are rendered as parts of pages of the file (col. 25, lines 34-46, PDL master page files 122 and the PDL variable page files 137 and 138 are merged into PDL file 450 and then provided to the print system 79). Sinofsky '178

discloses a single file containing separate sub-images (col. 3, lines 6-19, compound document that contains sub-files).

The applicant argues on page 14 of the response in essence that:

Warmus '149 and Sinofsky '178 do not disclose images and sub-images linked within a single file.

c. Sinofsky '178 discloses a single file document containing separate sub-images (col. 3, lines 6-19, compound document that contains sub-files); and providing links within the file linking one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images (col. 3, lines 30-34, text file 102 contains link 121 and 122 to other files).

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 8 and 13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Response to Amendment

3. The applicant has not traversed the examiner's assertion of official notice for the assertions provided in claims 10, 16, 17, 18, 24 and 25. Therefore, the common knowledge or well-known in the art statement is taken to be admitted prior art

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2625

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-7, 9, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warmus '149 in view of Sinofsky '178 and Simpson '803.

Referring to **claim 1**, Warmus '149 discloses in an image rendering environment, a method for dynamically adding one or more document indicia to a document when rendering the document, the method comprising: providing a rendering job in a native format that supports at least one of (i) multiple pages, and (ii) multiple images (col. 7, lines 1-6, page description language);

storing one or more document indicia (col. 9, lines 57-61, personalized information, variable image, or the like) as separate sub-images in a native format (col. 7, lines 1-6, variable page files);

correlating one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images (col. 7, lines 24-36, master and variable page files merged);

defining an ordered subset of the sub-images to apply to the document (col. 7, lines 6-10, press command file specifies the manner in which the master and variable files are to be merged);

wherein a rendering device:

receives the single file in the native format (col. 23, lines 21-35, process the TIFF file for printing); and

renders the single file, wherein the one or more sub-images are rendered as parts of the one or more pages of the document based on an association process, wherein the association process is one of (i) an overlay process, (ii) an underlay process, and (iii) a composite process (col. 20, lines 1-10, overlay the variable pages on the master pages).

Warmus '149 does not disclose expressly rendering the document without using a printer driver.

Simpson '803 discloses rendering a document without using a printer driver (col. 1, lines 39-51, computer generates a print job without the use of a print driver).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to generate a document without using a printer driver. The motivation for doing so would have been to eliminate the need to specifically configure a computer to make use of many printers.

Warmus '149 does not disclose expressly storing separate sub-images in the single file.

Sinofsky '178 discloses a single file document containing separate sub-images (col. 3, lines 6-19, compound document that contains sub-files); and

providing links within the file linking one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images (col. 3, lines 30-34, text file 102 contains link 121 and 122 to other files).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate multiple files into one comprehensive file and provide links within

that file. The motivation for doing so would have been to maintain the integrity of the comprehensive file. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Simpson '803 and Sinofsky '178 with Warmus '149 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Referring to **claim 2**, Warmus '149 discloses wherein the native format is one of:

- (i) a tagged image file format; and
- (ii) a portable document format (col. 4, lines 21-31, TIFF file).

Referring to **claim 3**, Warmus '149 discloses wherein the document indicia is disbound from page data of the rendering job (col. 20, lines 1-10, overlay the variable pages on the master pages).

Referring to **claim 4**, Warmus '149 discloses wherein correlating one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images comprises a linking the one or more pages in a next list (col. 7, lines 6-10, press command file specifies the manner in which the master and variable files are to be merged).

Sinofsky '178 discloses linking one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images (col. 3, lines 30-34, text file 102 contains link 121 and 122 to other files).

Referring to **claim 5**, Warmus '149 discloses wherein correlating one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images comprises a sub-chaining the one or more sub-images from page images by a sub list (col. 7, lines 6-10, press command file specifies the manner in which the master and variable files are to be merged).

Sinofsky '178 discloses linking one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images (col. 3, lines 30-34, text file 102 contains link 121 and 122 to other files).

Referring to **claim 6**, Warmus '149 discloses wherein correlating one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images comprises sub-chaining the one or more sub-images within sub-images (col. 11-12, lines 62-67, 1-22, object inserted defined by cursor, user can insert multiple objects).

Sinofsky '178 discloses linking one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images (col. 3, lines 30-34, text file 102 contains link 121 and 122 to other files).

Referring to **claim 7**, Warmus '149 discloses wherein defining an ordered subset of the sub-images comprises creating a set of instructions in one of

- (i) a dynamic manner, and
- (ii) a static manner (col. 20, lines 49-54).

Referring to **claim 9**, Warmus '149 discloses wherein all the sub-images are in the native format (col. 4, lines 21-31, TIFF file).

Sinofsky '178 discloses a single file document containing separate sub-images (col. 3, lines 6-19, compound document that contains sub-files).

Referring to **claim 11**, Warmus '149 discloses wherein the native format is an image format (col. 4, lines 21-31, TIFF file).

Referring to **claim 12**, Simpson '803 discloses wherein rendering the rendering job occurs within a printing device rendering and printing the document without

rasterization (col. 1, lines 39-51, computer generates a print job without the use of a print driver).

6. Claims 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warmus '149, Simpson '803, and Sinofsky '178 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Janse '434.

Referring to **claim 8**, Warmus '149 discloses wherein the one or more sub-images are placed at one or more locations of the one or more pages of the document and at one or more scales defined by information, the information being defined independently of the pages of the document (col. 20, lines 17-23, instruction set specifying how the pages should be positioned is incorporated into press command file 140).

Warmus '149 does not disclose expressly storing the location and scale information within the single document file.

Janse '434 discloses a single document file containing print setting information (Fig. 6, col. 7, lines 23-37, TIFF file comprises tear-off part 37 which defines print settings).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate print setting information into one comprehensive document file. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide easier methods of handling, processing and archiving the single file. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Janse '434 with Warmus '149 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

7. Claim 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warmus '149, Sinofsky '178, and Simpson '803 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of well known prior art.

Referring to **claim 10**, Warmus '149 discloses wherein the overlay process includes applying an overlay on top of one of:

(i) a page image; and

(ii) another sub-image (col. 20, lines 1-10, overlay the variable pages on the master pages).

Warmus '149 does not disclose expressly applying an underlay process.

Official Notice is taken that it is well known and obvious in the art to apply an underlay (See MPEP 2144.03). The motivation for doing so would have been to retain the information of the master page of the overlapping region as opposed to the variable page. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine well known prior art with Warmus '149 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

8. Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warmus '149 in view of Simpson '803, Sinofsky '178 and Hayosh '553.

Referring to **claim 13**, Warmus '149 discloses in a printing environment, a method for adding document indicia when printing an image, the method comprising: using a multi-subfile extension (Fig. 5, col. 11, lines 18-29, file 130 includes file portions) to represent multiple sub-images of a TIFF image within a single TIFF

Art Unit: 2625

document file, wherein data of the TIFF image is not converted into printing instructions by an application (col. 23, lines 21-23, files 122, 137, and 138 preprocessed to TIFF format);

using an extension to group and locate the sub-images on a page (Fig. 5, col. 11, lines 18-29, file 130 includes file portions);

performing at least one of:

supporting an overlay of the multiple sub-images on the page (col. 20, lines 1-10, overlay the variable pages on the master pages).;

supporting an underlay of the multiple sub-images on the page;

supporting a composite of the multiple sub-images on the page;

specifying a merge order of the multiple sub-images on the page;

specifying a location for merging the multiple sub-images on the page; and

specifying any scaling of the multiple sub-images; and

selectively rendering the TIFF image based on the electronic tags (col. 23, lines 21-35, process the pages for printing).

Warmus '149 does not disclose expressly rendering the document without using a printer driver.

Simpson '803 discloses rendering a document without using a printer driver (col. 1, lines 39-51, computer generates a print job without the use of a print driver).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to generate a document without using a printer driver. The motivation for doing so would have been to eliminate the need to specifically

Warmus '149 does not disclose expressly a single file document containing separate sub-images.

Sinofsky '178 discloses a single file document containing separate sub-images (col. 3, lines 6-19, compound document that contains sub-files).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate multiple files into one comprehensive file. The motivation for doing so would have been to maintain the integrity of the comprehensive file.

Warmus '149 discloses overlaying images onto a page but does not disclose expressly using electronic tags of a TIFF document file.

Hayosh '553 discloses using electronic tags of a TIFF document file (col. 5, lines 40-48, TIFF tags used to describe the attributes of the image).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize electronic TIFF tags. The motivation for doing so would have been to utilize a standardized programming format to establish print attributes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sinofsky '178 and Hayosh '553 with Warmus '149 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 13.

Referring to **claim 14**, Warmus '149 discloses wherein the overlay process includes applying an overlay on top of one of:

- (i) a page image; and
- (ii) another sub-image (col. 20, lines 1-10, overlay the variable pages on the master pages).

Referring to **claim 15**, Warmus '149 discloses specifying both a location for merging the multiple sub-images on the page and scaling of the multiple sub-images (col. 20, lines 17-23, instruction set specifying how the pages should be positioned is incorporated into press command file 140).

Warmus '149 does not disclose expressly specifying the location and scale information with electronic tags.

Hayosh '553 discloses using electronic tags of a TIFF document file (col. 5, lines 40-48, TIFF tags used to describe the attributes of the image).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize electronic TIFF tags to specify location and scaling of images. The motivation for doing so would have been to utilize a standardized programming format to establish print attributes. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sinofsky '178 and Hayosh '553 with Warmus '149 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

9. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warmus '149, Simpson '803, Sinofsky '178 and Hayosh '553, as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of well known prior art.

Referring to **claim 16**, see the rejection of claim 10 above.

Referring to **claim 17**, Warmus '149 discloses adding document indicia to a document but does not disclose expressly a watermark.

Official Notice is taken that it is well known and obvious in the art to utilize a watermark when printing a document (See MPEP 2144.03). The motivation for doing

so would have been to protect a document from counterfeit. Therefore it would have been obvious to combine well known prior art with Warmus '149 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Referring to **claim 18**, see the rejection of claim 10 above.

10. Claims 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warmus '149 in view of Sinofsky '178.

Referring to **claim 19**, Warmus '149 discloses a computer readable medium storing a computer program product for implementing within a computer system a method for dynamically adding one or more document indicia to a document when rendering the document, the computer program product comprising computer program code means utilized to implement the method, wherein the computer program code means is comprised of executable code for:

initiating a rendering job of a document as a single file, where the rendering job is in a native format that supports at least one of (i) multiple pages, and (ii) multiple images (col. 7, lines 1-6, page description language);

storing one or more document indicia (col. 9, lines 57-61, personalized information, variable image, or the like) as separate sub-images in a native format (col. 7, lines 1-6, variable page files) along with images representing one or more pages of the document (col. 20, lines 1-10, master pages 122)

correlating one or more pages of the document with one or more of the sub-images (col. 7, lines 24-36, master and variable page files merged);

defining an ordered subset of the sub-images to apply to the document (col. 7, lines 6-10, press command file specifies the manner in which the master and variable files are to be merged); and

using a process to associate the one or more sub-images with one or more of the pages of the document when rendering the document, wherein the process is one of (i) an overlay process, (ii) an underlay process, and (iii) a composite process (col. 20, lines 1-10, overlay the variable pages on the master pages).

Warmus '149 does not disclose expressly a single file document containing separate sub-images.

Sinofsky '178 discloses a single file document containing separate sub-images (col. 3, lines 6-19, compound document that contains sub-files).

At the time of the invention, it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate multiple files into one comprehensive file. The motivation for doing so would have been to maintain the integrity of the comprehensive file. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Sinofsky '178 with Warmus '149 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

Referring to **claim 20**, see the rejection of claim 2 above.

Referring to **claim 21**, see the rejection of claim 4 above.

Referring to **claim 22**, see the rejection of claim 7 above.

Referring to **claim 23**, see the rejection of claim 18 above.

11. Claim 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warmus '149 and Sinofsky '178 as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of Janse '434.

Referring to **claim 24**, see the rejection of claim 8 above.

12. Claim 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warmus '149 and Sinofsky '178 as applied to claim 23 above, and further in view of well known prior art.

Referring to **claim 25**, see the rejection of claim 17 above.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter K. Huntsinger whose telephone number is (571)272-7435. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571)-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Peter K. Huntsinger/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625